

REMARKS

This is in response to the Official Action mailed on December 3, 2007. Entry of this amendment and favorable action is respectfully requested.

In regard to the rejection of claims 1-3, 23, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, the Applicant has removed the objectionable phrase from claim 1, as now amended, to overcome this rejection in regard to claim 1. In addition, the Applicant has added new claim 29, which flow allowed claim 20 to clarify the genericness of claim 29 and has depended claims 23, 26 and 28 from new claim 29. It is thus believed that these claims are definite. It is also believed that new claim 29 is generic, by changing the wording as will be explained.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 as being clearly anticipated by the Richey patent is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended to define over Richey by not only indicating the claim is mounted at a forward end of lift arms, as opposed to the Richey attachment, which is a rear mounted unit, but also by clearly defining a rigid link, to distinguish from the Richey multiple section, jointed link and also by indicating that controls of pivoting of the attachment support is positioned so that the second end of the rigid link that is connected to the loader frame is below the attachment support.

In the Richey device the claimed is essentially impossible to carry out, because all of the supports and control links for the loader bucket 28 in Richey are at the rear of the Richey bucket, and merely placing the Richey device on the forward end of lift arms would require completely re-working the unit, in order to meet the structure of Claim 1. The link portions 35 and 36 in Richey would have to be below the attachment pivot. The drawings in the present device disclose that forward pivoting of the attachment support is achievable by having the second pivot or second connection of the rigid link below the attachment support to provide for a direct longitudinal load on the rigid link when the lift arms of the loader are raised and the attachment support is also raised. There is no need for a jointed or folding linkage, and the rigid link of the present claims is connected below the attachment support in a position to tilt the attachment support and the container that is on the support forwardly as claimed.

The Richey device does not show or suggest this arrangement, and relies upon a

mounting where the center of gravity of the bucket has to be outwardly from the pivot between arms 26b and the bucket 28 to cause tilting of the bucket in direction away from its support links. The jointed link 35 and 36 that is provided merely is a restraint to keep the bucket from completely pivoting all the way downwardly in a complete dumping position as the bucket is raised.

The operation of the present structure in claim 1 is that the rigid link is made to actually cause the pivoting of the attachment support as the lift arms of the loader are raised, which means dumping of an attachment is controlled by controlling movement of the lift arms. The links 35 and 36 of Richey will go over center by themselves or by manually moving the handle 37 when the bucket is raised high enough, and then, suddenly and essentially uncontrollably, the bucket will dump under gravity until the bucket is stopped with a jolt when the links 35 and 36 straighten. The position of the center of gravity of the bucket causes the actual dumping in the Richey patent.

This construction that permits controlled dumping is clearly specified in claim 1 by indicating that the rigid link is attached to the loader frame, so that the pivoting of the attachment support for dumping will be controlled, and will work when the center of gravity is rearwardly of the pivot for the attachment support. The rigid link is to control pivoting not just limit or stop it.

Therefore, it is respectfully pointed out that claim 1, as now amended defines over the Richey device and is not only not anticipated, but is clearly patentable over Richey.

The claims which depend from claim 1, namely claims 3, 6 and 8 are allowable, it is respectfully submitted, with claim 1.

Independent claim 4 was rejected as being anticipated by the Langenfeld et al. patent, U.S. Patent No. 4,725,189, claim 4 has also been amended to patentably define over this reference by specifying that the first pivot for mounting the attachment support is spaced in a first direction from the pivotal mounting (which is the mounting for the lift arms), and there is at least one link attached to the attachment support proximate an end of the attachment support that is at a position spaced a greater distance from the pivotal mounting on the first pivot, and the link is attachable to other portions of the loader frame at a second pivot which is below the attachment

support. The cylinder claimed acts to move the lift arms relative to the second pivot for causing pivotal movement of the attachment support about the first pivot. Then, with the connection of the control link below the attachment support, the link is in tension to cause dumping, and it is entirely different from the rear mounted loader bucket shown in Langenfeld et al. patent. There is no suggestion nor even any possible construction that would provide for an attachment to the bucket shown in Langenfeld to provide a link below the attachment for permitting the Lanenfeldt bucket to tilt when the cylinder is actuated. Thus, claim 4 is believed allowable.

New claim 29 has been added as a generic claim, based upon claim 1, but with the difference in that the claim calls for a loader, which includes the loader frame, and a loader arm pivoted on the frame. This loader is shown in FIGS. 3 and 10, and the loader frame is part of the loader. The link claimed in claim 29 is connected to a portion of the loader, which includes both the loader frame and the loader arm, and thus includes parts that are carried with the loader arm. Thus, again, FIGS. 3 and 10 support this language, in that the loader encompasses both parts of the construction and includes a loader frame.

Also, the loader comprises the loader frame and the loader arms on which the work attachment is mounted, and therefore in claim 29, which has been changed to recite that the work attachment is for a loader having a loader frame and a loader arm, the loader arm being pivotally attached to and movable relative to the loader frame. The claim specifies that the work attachment comprises a mount connectable to the loader arm, and it comprises a support that has the first pivot mount for operable pivoting mounting to the loader arm, as recited in allowed claim 20, and a second pivot mount for pivotal mounting to a solid link mechanism. The second end of the solid link mechanism is adapted to be pivotally mounted onto a portion of the loader, which, as recited in the introductory part of claim 29, includes both the loader frame and the loader arm. The second portion of the loader then can either be carried by a part of the loader arm, which is part of the loader, or the loader frame, which is also part of the loader. In claim 29 the second end of the link mechanism is connected to a portion of the loader, and the portion of the loader and the first pivot mount are movable relative to each other when the support is mounted onto the loader arm.

This relative movability in claim 29 can be either by the movement of the loader arm relative to the loader frame, as shown in FIG. 3, or can be caused by movement of a part carried by the loader arm, such as the tilting plate that is shown in FIGS. 10 and 11. The construction clearly differentiates from Richey in that there is no over center jointed link for restraining the bucket. Claim 29 has the second end of the solid link mechanism adapted to be connected to the portion of the loader below the support, so claim 29 is also patentable over the British reference No. 757,638 and Langenfeldt et al for the reasons set forth in regard to claim 4.

Thus, amended claim 23 which depends from new claim 29, is in line with the wording in claim 29, since the solid link mechanism is connectable to a tilting attachment plate that is part of the loader and which is carried at a forward end of a loader arm. In claim 23, the tilting plate specifically comprises the portion of the loader of claim 29. An actuator in claim 23 is for moving the tilting attachment plate to cause the relative movement of the first pivot mount and the portion of the loader. The relative movement that causes the pivoting of the support about the first pivot mount is between the attachment plate and the first pivot mount.

Claim 26 depends from claim 23, and adds additional features, as does claim 28. It is respectfully believed that these dependent claims are therefore allowable with claim 29.

The allowance of claims 9-20, 22, 24 and 25 is noted with appreciation.

A fee of \$210 for the new independent claim is included on a form 2038.

Favorable action on these claims is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Nickolas E. Westman, Reg. No. 20,147
Suite 1400

900 Second Avenue South

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319

Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

NEW:rkp